

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-14, 17, 18, 23-27, 30-32, 39-42, 45, 46, 51-55, 58-60, 67-70, 73, 74, 79-83, and 86-139 are pending, with claims 1, 32, 60, 88, 105, and 120 being independent. Claims 2-7, 15, 16, 19-22, 28, 29, 33-38, 43, 44, 47-50, 56, 57, 61-66, 71, 72, 75-78, 84, and 85 are cancelled by this amendment without waiver or prejudice. Claims 88-139 are added by this amendment. No new matter is being added.

Claims 1-16, 19-44, 47-72, and 75-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan (6,075,863) in view of Onosaka (5,961,608). With respect to canceled claims 2-7, 15, 16, 19-22, 28, 29, 33-38, 43, 44, 47-50, 56, 57, 61-66, 71, 72, 75-78, 84, and 85, this rejection is rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants have obviated this rejection by amending independent claims 1, 32, and 60.

As amended, claims 1, 32, and 60 recite a system (claim 1), a method (claim 32) and a computer program (claim 60) for installing computer software components on a client device for enabling connectivity to a host system by at least one of several different hardware devices that includes, among other features, detecting a new hardware device and, based on detecting the new hardware device, determining whether a connectivity component is stored locally that is needed to enable the connectivity between the client device and the host system using the new hardware device. If the connectivity component that is needed is not stored locally on the client device, then an updated connectivity component is received from a remote server to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using the new hardware device.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Krishnan and Onosaka, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest these features. Specifically, neither Krishnan nor Onosaka describes or suggests detecting a new hardware device and, based on detecting the new hardware device, receiving an updated connectivity component from a remote server when the connectivity component that is needed is not detected on the client device, as recited in amended claims 1, 32, and 60.

Krishnan describes using applets to control a modem, where the applets are used to maintain up-to-date communications protocols and to update the modem with new features and

capabilities. The applets may be loaded into the modem from a local computer or may be downloaded from a remote device or computer. See Krishnan, col. 3, lines 24-44.

Krishnan also describes using applets to provide updates or upgrades of modem control software stored in ROM. "The use of applets to control modem 10 provides for easy upgrades or updates of modem control software stored in the alterable portion of ROM 22. For example, if modem 10 connects to a remote modem having a different modem communications protocol, the two modems may negotiate to transfer an applet for the better protocol (i.e. newer, or faster, or more robust). Thus, the modem having the older software is updated to the latest version." See Krishnan, col. 5, lines 33-40.

Onosaka describes providing a user interface and control mechanism for remote communication that supports multiple modems being connected to and disconnected from a computer. See Onosaka, col. 2, lines 19-26. Onosaka also describes automatically detecting the device being connected, and in response selects the newly connected modem as the active communication device. See Onosaka, col. 2, lines 30-35.

Krishnan and Onosaka, either alone or in combination, do not describe the features of automatically detecting a new hardware device, detecting whether a connectivity component that is needed is locally available on the client device, and downloading an updated connectivity component from a remote server if the connectivity component that is needed is not on the client device, as recited in amended claims 1, 32, and 60. The combination of Krishnan and Onosaka do not teach the nexus that is required between detecting a new hardware device, detecting that the connectivity component is not present on the client device, and then downloading the needed connectivity component from a remote server when needed.

Although Krishnan describes negotiating an upgraded applet to update existing modem control software, Krishnan fails because it does not describe recognizing that a new connectivity component is needed based on automatically detecting new hardware and downloading the new component from a remote server when the needed component is missing from the local device. Onosaka fails to remedy Krishnan's shortcomings. Although Onosaka describes automatically detecting a device being connected to the computer, Onosaka fails because it does not describe

detecting that an updated connectivity component is needed from a remote server in response to the automatic detection of the new hardware device.

Thus, Krishnan and Onosaka do not describe or suggest downloading a connectivity component from a remote computer in response to the automatic detection of a new hardware device, after determining that the connectivity component is not present on the client device, as recited in amended claims 1, 32, and 60.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of amended claims 1, 32, and 60, and their dependent claims 8-14, 23-27, 30, 31, 39-42, 51-55, 58, 59, 67-70, 79-83, 86, and 87.

Claims 17, 18, 45, 46, 73, and 74, which depend from amended independent claims 1, 32, and 60, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnan in view of Onosaka and further in view of Coutts (6,311,165). As discussed above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 32, and 60, Krishnan and Onosaka, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or teach the features in the amended independent claims. Coutts fails to remedy the Krishnan and Onosaka shortcomings. For at least this reason, and based on their dependency from the amended independent claims 1, 32, and 60, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 18, 45, 46, 73, and 74.

New independent claims 88, 105, and 120 recite a system (claim 88), a method (claim 105), and a computer program (claim 120) for enabling connectivity to a host system by at least one of several different hardware devices that includes, among other features, receiving and copying multiple connectivity components from a compact disk that are stored in a dormant state on the client device. At least one of the connectivity components is installed when it is detected that the connectivity component is needed to enable connectivity between the client device and the host system using a selected hardware device.

Applicants request allowance of these new independent claims and their dependent claims because the art of record fails to describe or suggest these features. Specifically, Krishnan and Onosaka, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest copying

Applicant : Tuan Huu Pham et al.
Serial No. : 09/855,683
Filed : May 16, 2001
Page : 29 of 29

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-
136001 / Communications 38

multiple connectivity components from a compact disk and installing at least one of the connectivity components on the client device when it is needed to enable connectivity.


Krishnan describes storing multiple applets in random access memory (RAM) and downloading applets from a remote computer. See Krishnan, col. 3, lines 25-31. Krishnan does not describe or suggest copying multiple connectivity components from a compact disk. Onosaka is not relied upon in the office action to describe these features.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the new independent claims 88, 105, and 120 and their respective dependent claims.

Enclosed is a \$548 check of which \$438 is for excess claim fees and a \$110 is for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. During the pendency of this application, please apply any other deficiencies or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/17/2004



Joseph F. Key
Reg. No. 44,827

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331